

App. Ser. No. 09/621,825
Amendment dated May 17, 2006
Reply to Office action of Feb. 17, 2006

Docket No. AB-1634 US
Ref. No. LW6001 US/SJ

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The above amendment and the following remarks are in reply to the non-final Office action of 02/17/2006. In light of this reply, reconsideration and further examination of this application are respectfully requested.

Twenty-three claims (1 – 23) were pending in this application. Of these, ten claims (2 – 4, 6 – 8 and 14 – 17) were previously withdrawn as drawn to non-elected species. In the above amendment, one claim (1) was amended, and none was cancelled or added. Accordingly, 23 claims remain pending in this application, of which thirteen (1, 5, 9 – 13, and 18 – 23) have been elected for prosecution.

In Section 2 of the Office action, the Examiner objected to claim 1 because of an informality relating to a redundant term “and” at line 12 and required correction.

Responsively, the Applicant has amended claim 1 above to eliminate the informality.

In Section 4 of the Office action, the examiner rejected claims 1, 5, 9 – 13, and 18 – 23 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yun et al., U.S. Pat. No. 5,835,139 (“Yun”), in view of Murai, U.S. Pat. No. 5,986,726 (“Murai”), and further in view of Williamson et al., U.S. Pat. No. 5,475,381 (“Williamson”).

In light of the remarks that follow, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

To establish a prima facie case of obviousness, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves, or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the relevant art, to modify the references or to combine their teachings (MPEP §706.02(j)). However, a careful review of each of Yun, Murai and Williamson above reveals that none of these references provides any suggestion or motivation whatsoever for combining their respective teachings in the manner proposed by the Examiner, and further, it is asserted that such proposed combinations or modifications are not within the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art without the “roadmap,” i.e., the detailed disclosure, provided by the present invention. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner’s rejections of at least independent claims 1, 5 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) fail to present a prima facie case of obviousness in accordance with MPEP §706.02(j) and should therefore be withdrawn.


App. Ser. No. 09/621,825
Amendment dated May 17, 2006
Reply to Office action of Feb. 17, 2006

Docket No. AB-1634 US
Ref. No. LW6001 US/SJ

Additionally, the Applicant notes that the portable computer of Williamson includes a touch sensitive transparent keypad 51 internally provided (Williamson, FIG. 2). In contrast, the present invention includes an input unit provided externally to the monitor (independent claims 1, 5 and 18). Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Williamson does not teach or suggest the features of the present invention as claimed in at least independent claims 1, 15 and 18.

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1, 5, 9 – 13 and 18 – 23 are allowable over the art of record. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

If there are any questions regarding this Reply, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the number indicated below.

Certification of Facsimile Transmission	
I hereby certify that this paper is being facsimile transmitted to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on the date shown below.	
	May 17, 2006
	Date of Signature

Respectfully submitted,



Don C. Lawrence
Applicant's attorney
Reg. No. 31,975